NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES
TO FILE REHEARING MOTION
AND, IF FILED, DISPOSED OF.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT
OF APPEAL

OF FLORIDA

THIRD DISTRICT

JANUARY TERM, A.D. 1995

MAGDA MONTIEL DAVIS,	**	
Appellant,	**	
vs.	**	CASE NO. 94-2740
MARIETA FANDINO, et al.,	**	
Appellees.	**	

Opinion filed April 26, 1995.

An appeal from the Circuit Court for Dade County, Murray Goldman, Judge.

Kurzban, Kurzban & Weinger and Brian M. Torres and Bruce Rogow, for appellant.

Baker & McKenzie and Richard J. Ovelmen, for appellees.

Before SCHWARTZ, C.J., and NESBITT and GREEN, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Affirmed. *Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co.*, 497 U.S. 1, 110 S. Ct. 2695, 111 L. Ed. 2d 1 (1990).

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT
OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL
CIRCUIT IN AND FOR
DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

MAGDA MONTIEL DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MARIETA FANDINO,
HILDA INCLAN, and
MARIETA FANDINO
d/b/a "LA VERDAD,"

Defendants.
_____/

GENERAL JURISDICTION
DIVISION (30)

CASE NUMBER: 92-2238

FINAL JUDGMENT OF DISMISSAL

THIS CAUSE came before the Court on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint. Having heard argument of counsel, analyzed the memoranda of law submitted by the parties, reviewed the operative pleadings, and being otherwise fully advised, this Court rules that the Motion to Dismiss is *GRANTED* with prejudice, and a FINAL JUDGMENT OF DISMISSAL is hereby *ENTERED*.

1. This Court *FINDS* that the statements sued upon are protected by the First Amendment as non-actionable expression constituting political opinion and judgments. Under our Constitution, political debate is to be "wide-open and robust," and criticism of candidates for public office is permitted to be "caustic, vituperative, and rife with rhetorical hyperbole or vigorous epithet." *Milkovich*

v. Lorain Journal Co., 497 U.S. 16-17 (1990); *Hustler Magazine v. Falwell*, 485 U.S. 46 (1988); *Letter Carriers v. Austin*, 418 U.S. 264 (1974); *Greenbelt Cooperative Publishing Assn. v. Bresler*, 398 U.S. 6 (1970); *Ocala Star-Banner Co. v. Damron*, 401 U.S. 295 (1971); *Monitor Patriot Co. v. Roy*, 401 U.S. 265 (1971).

The seminal decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co.*, controls the disposition of this case. In *Milkovich*, the Supreme Court explicitly held that expression indistinguishable from that published here is not actionable:

> Foremost, we think *Hepps* stands for the proposition that a statement on matters of public concern must be provable as false before there can be liability under state defamation law, at least in situations, like the present, where a media defendant is involved. *Thus, unlike the statement, "In my opinion Mayor Jones is a liar," the statement, "In my opinion Mayor Jones shows his abysmal ignorance by accepting the teachings of Marx and Lenin," would not be actionable.* Hepps ensures that a statement of opinion relating to matters of public concern which does not contain a provably false factual connotation will receive full constitutional protection.
>
> Next, the *Bresler-Letter Carriers-Falwell* line of cases provides protection for statements that cannot "reasonably [be] interpreted as stating actual facts" about an individual. *Falwell*, 485 U.S., at 50, 99 L Ed 2d 41, 108 Ct. 876. This provides assurance that public debate will not suffer for lack of "imaginative expression" or the "rhetorical hyperbole" which has traditionally added much to the discourse of our

> Nation. *See id.*, at 53-55, 99 L Ed 2d 41, 108 S Ct 876.

497 U.S. at 19-20. (emphasis added). Thus, in *Milkovich*, the statement that a public official has embraced Marxism was held to inherently involve political judgments and opinion, and not to constitute, or imply, a statement of fact which is verifiably false. Accordingly, it was not actionable. In the case at bar, the statement that the Plaintiff is "pro-Castro," or serves his interests, similarly constitutes an expression of political opinion and judgment which is not actionable.

As *Milkovich* explains, this result follows from a long line of Supreme Court decisions highly protective of defamatory political speech which is understood to communicate statements of opinion or political judgments, as opposed to false statements of verifiable fact. In *Greenbelt Cooperative Publishing Assoc.*, the Court held that accusing a public official of "blackmail" was not actionable, but rather was no more than vigorous epithet used to characterize his negotiating tactics. In *Letter Carriers v. Austin*, use of the term "traitors" to refer to nonunion workers was held not actionable. In *Hustler*, a political cartoon suggesting the plaintiff's first sexual experience was the act of incest with his mother in an outhouse was not actionable.

The statements sued upon here clearly fall within the ambit of protection afforded political speech by the First Amendment. The articles do no more than offer the author's political judgment and opinion that the plaintiff's views are much too sympathetic to the Castro regime.

That this Court finds the statements sued upon protected by the First Amendment does not mean that it endorses or approves of certain rhetorical excesses to be found in the articles. In particular, this Court finds repugnant and inappropriate the references to the plaintiff's spouse's ethnicity. But the First Amendment to our Constitution protects even these offensive characterizations, which this Court would have hoped would no longer be part of our political discourse.

2. The Amended Complaint is dismissed with prejudice. Because this Court finds that the published statements are protected by the First Amendment, Defendants' other grounds for dismissal need not be addressed. However, this Court does *FIND*, for the reasons set out more fully in the Defendants' Memorandum In Support of the Motion to Dismiss, that the Amended Complaint is deficient with respect to pleading factual allegations essential to a "public figure" defamation claim, and with respect to the claim for punitive damages. *Clark v. Boeing*, 395 So. 2d 1226 (Fla. 3d DCA 1981); *Frieder v. Prince*, 308 So. 2d 132 (Fla. 3d DCA 1975); Section 768.72 Florida Statutes; *Key West Convalescent Center, Inc. v. Doherty*, 619 So. 2d 367 (Fla. 3d DCA 1993). It is therefore

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is granted with prejudice, this action is dismissed with prejudice, that Plaintiff take nothing by this action, and the Defendants go hence without day.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at Miami, Dade County, Florida, this 16 day of November, 1994.

/s/ Murray Goldman
MURRAY GOLDMAN
CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:

Ira J. Kurzban, Esquire
Richard J. Ovelmen, Esquire

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND
FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

GENERAL JURISDICTION DIVISION

CASE NO. 92-22382 CA 30
F.B.N. 796565

MAGDA MONTIEL DAVIS,
PLAINTIFF,
VS.
MARIETA FANDINO, HILDA INCLAN
and MARIETA FANDINO d/b/a
"LA VERDAD",
DEFENDANTS.

AMENDED COMPLAINT

PLAINTIFF, MAGDA MONTIEL DAVIS, (hereinafter "Montiel Davis") by and through the undersigned counsel, sues the Defendants, MARIETA FANDINO, HILDA INCLAN and MARIETA FANDINO d/b/a *"LA VERDAD"*, (hereinafter "Defendants") and alleges:

PARTIES AND JURISDICTION

1. This is an action for damages in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000.00).

2. At all times material hereto, Montiel Davis was and is a resident of Dade County, Florida.

3. Montiel Davis is a licensed attorney engaged in the practice of law in Dade County, Florida.

4. At all times material hereto, Defendants, Marieta Fandino and Hilda Inclan have been and are residents of Dade County, Florida.

5. Defendant Marieta Fandino d/b/a *"La Verdad"* is a so-called community newspaper published weekly for the Hispanic community and distributed throughout Greater Dade County, Florida, by the Defendants.

6. The Defendants, with the intent to injure the Montiel Davis' business and professional reputation, published libelous and false statements about Montiel Davis in *La Verdad* on September 24, 1992 and October 1, 1992.

7. Montiel Davis served Notice in writing upon the Defendants on September 30, 1992, and October 2, 1992, specifying the articles and the statements therein which were false and defamatory and requesting that the Defendants publish a retraction and apology in the newspaper in the same manner as the original publication within ten (10) days of service of the written notice or be the subject of legal action within five (5) days of service of the written notice (See correspondence attached hereto as Composite Exhibit "A").

8. Defendants have not retracted the false and libelous statements published on September 24, 1992 and October 1, 1992.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

9. For over thirty (30) years, the Cuban community in Miami, Florida (as well as its surrounding heavily

Cuban populated suburbs, i.e., Hialeah), has been dominated by persons who have actively demonstrated a direct and clear hostility against the regime of Fidel Castro in Cuba and anyone they believe (whether accurate or not) support that regime. The dominance of such persons in the Cuban community has been manifested by their violence, including lethal violence not only against individuals actually lending support to the Castro government, but even against individuals merely *perceived* as lending support in mere opinion or any other way.

10. In the last twenty years, certain Cuban exiles (later considered "heroes" within the Cuban community) have created a climate of fear and hatred in the Cuban community in Miami of anyone associated, or believed to be associated, with the Castro regime or not militant against it by engaging in activities in Miami and other cities in the U.S. designed to punish, physically or otherwise, persons who seek to exercise their rights of artistic freedom, academic freedom, and freedom of the press or assembly.

11. These actions have included the following:

a. The execution of two members of the Committee of 75, a group of Cuban exiles who met in Cuba with government officials to negotiate for the release of political prisoners;

b. The attempted assassination of a local radio newscaster because he had made a remark which some merely perceived as being soft on communism and therefore supportive of the Castro regime.

c. The bombing, on two occasions in 1990, of the Cuban Museum in Miami and the violent threat of execution against its directors for exhibiting paintings created by persons residing in Cuba.

d. The placing of death threats against David Lawrence, the publisher of the Miami Herald, and two other Herald executives for the paper's criticism of the Cuban American National Foundation's Cuba legislation, as well as smearing Herald news boxes with excrement.

e. In November 1990, Miami City Commissioners approved the installation of a star for Mexican singer Veronica Castro in the "Walk of Fame" sidewalk on Calle Ocho. But following her performance in Cuba on December 3, of last year, a mob of approximately 100 people surrounded the star, urinated on it and hacked it apart with hammers, while police looked on and did nothing. The next day, the City Commissioners voted unanimously to bar any replacement of the star without its approval.

f. In 1989, the Kiwanis Club of Little Havana banned three singers, Brazilian Denise de Kalafe, Puerto Rican singer Andy Montanez, and De Raymond – who performed in Cuba in 1981, 1980 and 1970 respectively – from appearing at the annual Cuban-American Festival. The festival had received a $15,000 grant from the Miami City Commission. At the time of a similar 1987 dispute, the club's director of promotions told the *Miami News* that it has a strict policy to bar from the festival any Latin American entertainer who has performed inside Cuba.

g. Ruben Blades, the Panamanian-born actor, was denounced on Miami as a "Communist" and a "Castro Agent," which has interfered with his performing

career there. In 1991, the host of a radio program received threatening calls after Blades appeared.

h. In 1988 the home of Maria Cristina Herrera, the founder and director of the Institute for Cuban Studies at Miami Dade Community College, was bombed.

i. In 1989, two bombs went off in the office of Marazul Travel – one of several companies engaged in lawful licensed travel to Cuba.

j. On February 23, 1992 three men assaulted and tied up employees at Radio Progresso and damaged the station's equipment.

k. On March 17, 1993 a legally authorized picket in front of radio Station WAQI called by the Alliance Workers of the Cuban Community (ATC) came under violent attack by more than 300 persons, many of them members of militant anti-Castro organizations who were called by Armando Perez Roura, general manager and news director of Radio Station WAQI to break up the demonstration.

12. These acts and many others often extend to persons who do not support the Castro Regime, but who may be involved in lawful businesses in sending food and medicine to their relatives in Cuba, and even lawfully seeking to visit those relatives.

13. In sum, certain persons who have dominated the Cuban community in the South Florida area have an expansively broad definition of being a Castro supporter and a person who is labeled as such, whether correctly or not, in the Cuban community is subject to verbal abuse,

economic sanctions, harassment, intimidation, physical violence and even death.

14. An environment has been created in the Cuban community that any other expression is immediately labeled and proclaimed by the Cuban community and its so-called newspapers as acts of treason *against* the solidarity of the (Miami) Cuban community.

15. In fact, a common bumper sticker seen any day in Miami spells out:

> "The only dialogue with Castro: Blindfolds, yes or no?"

16. Because of the totality of the circumstances created and existing within the Cuban community involving this anti-Castro obsession and frenzy, to be denounced as a "Castrista," or as Castro's representative, effectively and without a doubt *immediately* singles a person as a Communist and Castro supporter and summons the hatred, violence, contempt and prejudice of the audience towards the individual singled out.

17. Montiel Davis has been an attorney in the State of Florida since 1978. She announced her candidacy for U.S. Congress on or about July 13, 1992; she received her first bomb and life threats along with exhibitions of public disgust, contempt, humiliation and ridicule from the general public in Miami *immediately* after the Defendants' articles were published denouncing her as a "Castrista" and Castro's representative.

PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS

18. On or about September 24, 1992, on pages 1 and 7 of the newspaper *"La Verdad"*, the Defendants stated that Montiel Davis was a supporter of Fidel Castro ("Castrista").

19. The defendant made the statements with actual malice and knowledge that their statements would be perceived by the Cuban community, under the circumstances under which they were made, in the context in which they were made by Defendants, and in their totality, as allegations of fact that Montiel Davis had membership in organizations and well-defined political affiliations and beliefs, contrary to the Cuban community, and that the statements were false or with reckless disregard as to their truthfulness.

20. On or about October 1, 1992, the Defendants stated that Montiel Davis represents the interests of Fidel Castro in the United States. (See attached Composite Exhibit "B"). The Defendants made these statements with actual malice and knowledge that under the circumstances which the statements were made and in the context in which they were made and in their totality, that such statements would be perceived by the Cuban community as allegations of fact that Montiel Davis had membership in organizations, and well defined political affiliations and beiefs [sic] against the Cuban community in South Florida which would damage her reputation.

21. That the statements made by Defendants labeling Montiel Davis a "Castrista", and a representative of Castro in the United States were made with express malice and knowledge that the statements were false or with

reckless disregard as to their truthfulness and with the primary motive to injure Montiel Davis, rather than to conduct news reporting or protect any proper interest, knowing that in the medium and circumstances in which it was disseminated its audience would perceive such publication as statements of fact.

COUNT I

Libel Per Se

22. Plaintiff realleges and reavers paragraph 1 through 21 above as if fully set forth herein.

23. The statements are defamatory on their face.

24. The statements were false and were made with actual malice and knowledge that the statements were false, or with reckless disregard as to their truthfulness, and with a primary will to defame Montiel Davis and to injure Montiel Davis in her business, professional reputation and candidacy for United States Congress and as a representative of the people in South Florida.

25. The statements were purposefully made with the express and malicious intent to expose Montiel Davis to public hatred and contempt considering that in the Cuban-American community where the so-called community newspaper circulates, the statements clearly and convincingly, and on their face express terms of precision, meaning and usage continuously resulting in vicious abuse and even violence from the Community towards the individual or entity described with such terms.

26. The statements were purposefully made with the express and malicious intent to expose Montiel Davis

to public hatred and contempt considering that in the context in which the statements were made Defendants knew that the statements would be perceived as facts and not opinion by an audience which harbors hate and contempt for individuals associated with such precise terms.

27. The statements are false statements of verifiable facts and not mere expression of opinions.

28. The statements involve terms and concepts well-defined, established and recognized in the South Florida area targeted audience, rather than loose and varying terms, and are specifically susceptible to proof of truth or falsity in the South Florida area.

29. Defendants defamatory statements resulted in Montiel Davis' being subjected to name calling, bomb and life threats, and general ridicule and humiliation from total strangers to close friends and/or business associates, due to the hatred, contempt, prejudice and ridicule produced by Defendants' publications.

30. Montiel Davis has been damaged in her personal, professional and political life as a result of Defendant's conduct.

WHEREFORE, Montiel Davis demand [sic] this Honorable Court to enter a judgment in her favor for compensatory and punitive damages, and all other relief the court deems just and proper.

COUNT II

Libel

31. Montiel Davis realleges and reavers paragraph 1 through 21 above as fully set forth herein.

32. The statements are defamatory given the totality of the circumstances, including but not limited to the context in which they were published, the audience to which it was addressed to, and the well defined, precise, established and recognizable terms which they involved.

33. Defendants made the statements with actual malice and knowledge that the statements were false or with reckless disregard for whether they were false or not, in a context and circumstances where the statements would be regarded as factual rather than opinion by the audience.

34. The statements made by Defendant clearly and convincingly related to Montiel Davis' fitness for office as candidate for United States Congress.

35. Defendants defamatory statements resulted in Montiel Davis's being subjected to name calling, bomb threats, and general ridicule from total stranger's [sic] and colleagues and business associates, due to the hatred, contempt, prejudice produced by Defendants' publication.

36. Montiel Davis has been damaged in her personal, professional and political life as a result of Defendants' conduct.

WHEREFORE, MONTIEL DAVIS demands this Honorable Court to enter judgment in her favor for compensatory and punitive damages due to the express and actual malice on the part of the express and actual malice on the part of the Defendants and all other relief the court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ _____

LAZARA L. BALSEIRO, ESQ.
THE LAW FIRM OF
LAZARA LOURDES
BALSEIRO, P.A.
2650 S.W. 27 AVE. S-304
305-856-2056

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and complete copy of the foregoing has been mailed to Richard Ovelmen, Esq. at Baker & McKenzie, 701 Brickell Avenue, Miami, Florida, 33131 on this 14th day of March, 1994.

/s/ _____

LAZARA L. BALSEIRO, ESQ.

COMPOSITE "A"

Law Offices of
Lazara L. Balseiro, P.A.
ATTORNEY AT LAW

2650 S.W. 27th Avenue
Second Floor
Miami, Florida 33133
Telephone: (305) 446-1151
Fax: (305) 444-3503

September 30, 1992

Ms. Marieta Fandino and
Ms. Hilda Inclan
Radio Station WWFE
2381 W. Flagler Street
Miami, FL 33135

RE: Notice Pursuant to Florida Statutes §§ 770.01 and 770.02

Dear Ms. Fandino & Ms. Inclan:

Please be advised that I represent Magda Montiel Davis. On September 24, 1992 your newspaper ran a headline on both the front page and page 7, describing Ms. Davis as a supporter of Fidel Castro ("Castrista"). You also published a statement that Ms. Davis shares office space and is an associate of Mr. Ira Kurzban. When you published these statements, you knew them to be completely false and libelous.

Pursuant to Florida law, we will initiate legal action against you within five (5) days of this notice and you will have ten (10) days from today's date to place a retraction and apology in your newspaper in the same location and in the same manner as the original publication.

You and the newspaper will also be held personally responsible for any incitement to violence against Ms. Davis or her campaign that your article may cause.

PLEASE GOVERN YOURSELF ACCORDINGLY.

Sincerely,

/s/ Lazara L. Balseiro
LAZARA BALSEIRO, ESQ.

LB/mc

Law Offices of
Lazara L. Balseiro, P.A.
ATTORNEY AT LAW

2650 S.W. 27th Avenue
Second Floor
Miami, Florida 33133
Telephone: (305) 446-1151
Fax: (305) 444-3503

October 2, 1992

Ms. Marieta Fandino and
Ms. Hilda Inclan
Radio Station WWFE
2381 W. Flagler Street
Miami, FL 33135

RE: Notice Pursuant to Florida Statutes §§ 770.01 and 770.02

Dear Ms. Fandino & Ms. Inclan:

On September 30, 1992 you were hand delivered a letter explaining to you the law of the State of Florida

concerning libel and slander, and your need to print a retraction and apology for the false and libelous statements you have published.

On October 1, 1992 you ignored the letter, and again published the same false and defamatory statements concerning Magda Montiel Davis. In the article of October 1, at page 7, and on the cover of your "newspaper," you again state that Ms. Davis represents the interests of Fidel Castro in the United States.

Please be advised that litigation will be instituted against you for this false and defamatory statement within five (5) days if an apology and retraction is not published within ten (10) days of the date of this letter. We will add to our claim against you exemplary and other damages.

PLEASE GOVERN YOURSELF ACCORDINGLY.

Sincerely,

/s/ Lazara L. Balseiro
LAZARA BALSEIRO, ESQ.

LB/mc

COMPOSITE "B"

La Verdad

LA LLAMADA LEY TORRICELLI ES UNA JUGADA TRAIDORA DE LOS CUBANOS MALNACIDOS

NO. 11 OCTUBRE DE 1992 DIRECTORA MARIELA GANDINO P.O. BOX 455 RIVERSIDE STA. MIAMI FL. 33135

opinion de la directora

NUESTRA LEGISLADORA ILEANA ROS SE ENFRENTA A LA DEFENSORA DEL CASTRISMO

MAS PRUEBAS DE LOS VINCULOS DE MAGDA MONTIEL CON EL TIRANO CASTRO

LA PATRIA CUBANA EXIGE EL AJUSTICIAMIENTO DEL TIRANO FIDEL CASTRO

MAS PRUEBAS DE LOS VINCULOS DE MONTIEL DAVIS CON EL TIRANO CASTRO

por hilda inclán

En un número anterior de La Verdad, publicamos documentos legales del record público de la corte judicial donde aparecía Ira J. Kurzban, esposo de la contrincante de Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Magda Montiel Davis, como abogado de Pancho Aruca y de Marazul, firma extranjera que pertenece al gobierno de Fidel Castro en Cuba.

Hicimos la aclaración entonces de que esta Montiel Davis, abogada que nació en Cuba, comparte con su esposo el bufete legal de éste, lo ayuda y lo apoya, y políticamente se ha declarado en contra de todo lo que Ileana representa, que incluye la libertad de Cuba, causa que Ileana Ros-Lehtinen siempre ha defendido por sobre todo lo demás.

Más pruebas del nexo castrista de la demócrata que aspira al escaño de nuestra congresista Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.

Pues bien, nos siguen llegando informes de las vinculaciones de Kurzban con el gobierno del tirano que oprime nuestra patria. Y así como nos llegan estos documentos y los verificamos, los publicamos para el conocimiento de los votantes.

En 1979 y 1980, Kurzban, el esposo de la contrincante de Ileana, defendió al gobierno de Castro ante las córtes federales, solicitando la devolución para el tirano de más de $8 millones.

El caso de fecha diciembre 10 de 1979, tiene el número 79-112-CIV-CA. Los documentos de la corte federal del distrito demuestran que Ira Kurzban representó al Banco Nacional de Cuba y a la Empresa Cubana Exportadora de Alimentos y Productos Varios (Cubaexport) en este caso, junto al abogado Michael Krinsky, de Nueva York.

Según los argumentos de Kurzban en la corte, estas entidades del gobierno de Castro en Cuba fueron defraudadas de $8,775,000 en una carta de crédito usada para financiar una compra de café que no fue entregado.

Kurzban, pagado por sus servicios con dinero del gobierno cubano, hizo todo lo posible por conseguirle a Castro, la devolución de este dinero.

¿Se imaginan ustedes la felicidad de Kurzban si su esposa llegara al Congreso de los Estados Unidos en el escaño de Ileana? Sus oportunidades de servir a su cliente Fidel Castro se multiplicarían aún más...

Ileana nos salva del veneno pacifista y pro-Castrista de la Ley Torricelli.

Mientras tanto, nuestra congresista Ileana Ros-Lehtinen libró una titánica batalla dentro del Congreso de los Estados Unidos, que resultó un éxito para la causa de Cuba.

Ileana logró que se surprimiera de esta "nueva Ley" el inciso más negativo para los exiliados y para la causa de la liberación de Cuba: una declaración de que "Estados Unidos no tiene intenciones agresivas contra el régimen de Castro".

Ileana también logró la eliminación de otros "premios" para Castro que contenía esta polémica Ley. Estos son: una proposición de abrir oficinas recíprocas de noticias en Washington y en La Habana, así como los intercambios educacionales y científicos entre Cuba y los Estados Unidos. Todos estos contactos, que para la democracia

son aparentemente inofensivos, el sistema comunista cubano los aprovecha para infiltraciones, espionaje y ventajas de tipo político, explicó Ileana.

Su defensa de la Ley Torricelli ante el Congreso se limitó a explicar la necesidad de ejercer aún mayor presión económica contra Castro e insitió en que no se permitiera ningún escape legal a las sanciones contra las subsidiarias de firmas americanas en terceros países que han continuado comerciando con Castro, a razón de unos $706 millones anualmente.

Ileana se mantuvo firme en su defensa de prohibir terminantemente este comercio de las subsidiarias con Castro a pesar de la oposición de poderosos lobistas de firmas que han venido violando el embargo y beneficiando a Castro a través de terceros países, tales como Gillette, Exxon, la Goodyear y los elevadores Otis.

Se entiende, por lo tanto, que los que representan los intereses de Castro en el exilio, como Montiel Davis y su esposo Kurzban, ansíen sustituirla.

Claro, que se entiende también, que el pueblo cubano en el exilio *SALGA EN MASA* a votar por la máxima defensora de nuestros derechos y nuestros intereses en Washington, nuestra congresista, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.

Para votar por Ileana el 3 de noviembre hay que inscribirse como votante antes del próximo lunes, 5 de octubre.

Según un estimado publicado el martes, unos 100,000 ciudadanos norteamericanos de origen hispano no se han inscrito todavía para votar. Inscribirse es fácil y no cuesta nada. Sólo tiene que mostrar su prueba de ciudadanía. A cambio, le otorgarán una tarjeta oficial de votante, que además de servirle para votar, le servirá como prueba de ciudadanía para viajes a las Bahamas, las antillas holandesas y otros destinos. La inscripción no le obliga a ningún tipo de compromiso. Simplemente lo califica como ciudadano norteamericano con el derecho al voto. Si el día de las elecciones, usted decide que quiere votar y no está inscrito, no podrá hacerlo.

El último día para inscribirse es el próximo lunes, 5 de octubre. Habrán voluntarios inscribiendo votantes por los centros comerciales este fin de semana. ¡Inscríbase y vote!

Los que ya estén inscritos, voten hoy antes de las 7 p.m. EN CONTRA del "Alcalde Fuerte" Ponchen "NO" en la boleta.

Hoy, primero de octubre, se decidirán las campañas de segunda vuelta que se desprendieron de las elecciones primarias dentro de los partidos Republicano y Demócrata.

Pero más importante todavía, en elecciones abiertas a todos los votantes del Condado de Dade, sin importar partido político o municipio de residencia, se decidirán hoy una serie de enmiendas trascendentales a la constitución del Condado de Dade, que incluye al área completa del Gran Miami, con todas sus ciudades así como el área "no incorporada".

De estas enmiendas, la más significante es la que convertiría al alcalde de Metro-Dade, en alcalde ejecutivo, con derecho a vetar las decisiones de los comisionados, de contratar y despedir al administrador del condado y de manejar el presupuesto de $3,200 millones anuales.

Para crear un sistema así, sería necesario que el alcalde fuese un empleado a tiempo completo y no un "parttime" que gana $6,000 al año, mientras que el administrador a tiempo completo gana $157,000. Sería necesario también crear un congreso a nivel del condado con Cámara y Senado, para proteger el balance de poderes, al igual que se hace a nivel nacional y estatal.

De lo contrario, estaríamos creando un "Zar" en el Condado que, en efecto, anularía el poder de las minorías hispana y negra. En el nuevo sistema de elecciones de los comisionados del condado por distrito étnico que se está considerando ahora, los hispanos tendrían una mayoría en la comisión, reflejando la mayoría numérica que representan hoy en día en la población del Condado.

Pero el "Alcalde Fuerte", propuesto en la boleta electoral de hoy, electo por todo el condado y no por distritos étnicos, y con derecho a vetar las decisiones de los comisionados, en efecto anularía este nuevo poder que al cabo de tantos años de verse marginada políticamente, ha ganado ahora la comunidad hispana.

Por eso, recomiendo que ponchen "NO" a la enmienda para un "Alcalde Ejecutivo" (Fuerte) en Dade

App. 22

La Verdad
No. 1109 OCTOBER 1, 1992, page 7

OUR LEGISLATOR ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN TAKES ON THE DEFENDER OF CASTRO

MORE EVIDENCE OF MONTIEL DAVIS'S LINKS TO THE TYRANT CASTRO

MORE EVIDENCE OF MAGDA MONTIEL'S LINKS TO THE TYRANT CASTRO

by Hilda Inclán

[photo of Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen]

In an earlier edition of La Verdad, we published legal documents of the judicial court's public record in which Ira J. Kurzban, the husband of Ileana Ros-Lehtinen's opponent, Magda Montiel Davis, appeared as the lawyer for Pancho Aruca and Marazul, a foreign company which belongs to Fidel Castro's government in Cuba.

We made the clarification then that this Montiel Davis, a lawyer who was born in Cuba, is a member with her husband of the latter's law firm, helps and support [sic] him, and politically she has declared herself against everything that Ileana represents, which includes the liberty of Cuba, a cause which Ros-Lehtinen has always defended above everything else.

More evidence of the Castro link of the Democrat who is vying for the seat of our Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.

Now then, we continue receiving reports of Kurzban's links to the government of the tyrant who

oppresses our country. And so as we receive these documents and we verify them, we publish them for the information of the voters.

In 1979 and 1980, Kurzban, the husband of Ileana's opponent, defended Castro's government before the federal courts, requesting the return to the tyrant of more than 8 million dollars.

The case, dated December 10, 1979, bears number 79-112-CIV-CA. Documents of the Federal District Court reveal that Ira Kurzban represented the National Bank of Cuba and the Empresa Cubana Exportadora de Alimentos y Productos Varios (Cubaexport) in this case, together with lawyer Michael Krinsky, of New York.

According to Kurzban's arguments in court, these entities of Castro's government in Cuba were defrauded of $8,775,000 in a letter of credit used to finance a purchase of coffee which was not delivered.

Kurzban, paid for his services with Cuban government money, did everything possible to obtain for Castro the return of this money.

Can you imagine Kurzban's happiness if his wife made it to the United States Congress in Ileana's seat? Their opportunities to serve their client Fidel Castro would multiply even more . . .

Ileana saves us from the pacifist and pro-Castro venom of the Torricelli Act.

Meanwhile, our Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen waged a titanic battle in the United States Congress, which resulted in a victory for the Cuba cause.

Ileana managed to have deleted from this "new Act" the most negative paragraph for the exiles and for the cause of the liberation of Cuba: a declaration that the "United States has no aggressive intentions against the Castro regime."

Ileana also obtained the elimination of other "rewards" for Castro which this polemic Act contained. These are: a proposal to open reciprocal news bureaus in Washington and Havana, as well as educational and scientific exchanges between Cuba and the United States. All these contacts, which are apparently inoffensive for a democracy, are taken advantage of by the Cuban communist system for infiltrations, espionage and benefits of a political nature, explained Ileana.

Her defense of the Torricelli Act before Congress was limited to explaining the need to exercise even more economic pressure against Castro and she insisted that no legal loophole be permitted from the sanctions against subsidiaries of American firms in third countries which have continued trading with Castro, at the rate of some 706 million dollars annually.

Ileana remained firm in her defense of categorically prohibiting this trade of subsidiaries with Castro despite the opposition of powerful lobbyists of firms which have

been violating the embargo and benefitting [sic] Castro through third countries, such as Gillette, Exxon, Goodyear and Otis Elevators.

It is understood, therefore, that those who represent the interests of Castro in exile, such as Montiel Davis and her husband Kurzban, are anxious to replace her.

Of course, it is also understood that the Cuban people in exile WILL GO OUT EN MASSE to vote for the greatest defender of our rights and our interests in Washington, our Congresswoman, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.

In order to vote for Ileana on November 3rd, you must register to vote before next Monday, October 5th.

According to an estimate published on Tuesday, some 100,000 American citizens of Hispanic origin have still not registered to vote. Registration is easy and does not cost anything. You only have to show your proof of citizenship. In exchange, they will give you an official voter's card, which besides being used to vote, will serve as proof of citizenship for trips to the Bahamas, the Netherlands Antilles and other destinations. Registration does not bind you to any kind of commitment. It simply qualifies you as an American citizen with the right to vote. If on election day you decide that you want to vote and you are not registered, you will not be able to do so.

The last day to register is next Monday, October 5th. There will be volunteers registering voters in shopping centers this weekend. Register and vote!

Those who are already registered, vote today before 7 p.m. AGAINST the "Strong Mayor." Punch "NO" on the ballot.

Today, October first, the second round campaigns will be decided which stemmed from the primary elections within the Republican and Democratic Parties.

But more important still, in elections open to all voters from Dade County, without regard to political party or municipality of residence, a series of important amendments to Dade County's charter will be decided today, which includes the entire area of Greater Miami, with all its cities as well as the "unincorporated" area.

Of these amendments, the most significant one is that which would convert the Metro-Dade mayor into an executive mayor, with a right to veto decisions of the Commissioners, to hire and fire the county administrator and to manage the 3.2 billion dollar annual budget.

In order to create such a system, it would be necessary for the mayor to be a full-time employee and not a "part-time" one who earns $6,000 a year, while the full-time administrator earns $157,000. It would also be necessary to create a 'Congress' at the county level with a House and Senate, just as there is at the national and state level.

Otherwise, we would be creating a "Czar" in the County which, in effect, would cancel out the power of the Hispanic and black minorities. In the new system of elections of County Commissioners by ethnic district which is being considered now, Hispanics would have a majority on the Commission, reflecting the numerical majority which they currently represent in the population of the County.

However, the "Strong Mayor," proposed on today's electoral ballot, elected by the whole county and not by ethnic districts, and with the right to veto the decisions of the Commissioners, in effect would cancel out this new power which the Hispanic community has now earned, after so many years of being politically marginalized.

Therefore, I recommend that you punch "NO" to the amendment for an "Executive Strong Mayor" in Dade.

STATE OF FLORIDA)
) SS
COUNTY OF DADE)

BEFORE ME, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE STATE OF FLORIDA AT LARGE, PERSONALLY APPEARS DR. LUIS A. DE LA VEGA – VICE PRES. FOR AND ON BEHALF OF PROFESSIONAL TRANSLATING SERVICES, WHO, AFTER BEING DULY SWORN, DEPOSES AND SAYS THAT (S)HE IS FULLY VERSED IN THE SPANISH AND THE ENGLISH LANGUAGES, AND THAT THIS IS A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSLATION

OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT CONSISTING OF 2 PAGE(S), AND THAT THIS IS THE LAST OF THE ATTACHED.

/s/ Dr. Luis A. De La Vega, Vice Pres.

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED THIS 11th DAY OF April, A.D., 1994.

/s/ Angela Smith
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF FLORIDA AT LARGE

MY COMMISSION
EXPIRES: 12-27-96 (SEAL)

(SEAL) NOTARY PUBLIC,
STATE OF FLORIDA
ANGELA SMITH
COMMISSION NO: CC-243189
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
DEC. 27, 1996

The utmost care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of all translations. Professional Translating Services and its employees shall not be liable for any damages due to its own negligence or errors in typing or translation, nor shall it be liable for the negligence of third parties.

La Verdad

NO EXAGERAMOS AL ASEGURAR QUE LA MAFIA CUBANA EN MIAMI RECIBE ORDENES DEL CHACAL

NO. 110 SEPTIEMBRE 24 DE 1992 DIRECTORA MARIA PATRANDINO P.O. BOX 355 RIVERSIDE STA. MIAMI FL. 33135

opinion de la directora

RETO DEMOCRATA CASTRISTA A NUESTRA CONGRESISTA ILEANA ROS

ABUSOS CON LOS ALQUILERES DE CASAS Y APARTAMENTOS EN EL CONDADO DE DADE

LA PATRIA CUBANA EXIGE EL AJUSTICIAMIENTO DEL TIRANO FIDEL CASTRO

RETO CASTRISTA A NUESTRA CONGRESISTA ILEANA ROS

por hilda inclán

La pasada semana publicamos en esta página copia de los documentos legales del caso de la Oncena Corte Judicial del Condado de Dade, número 89-40564 CA 02, que demuestra que la oponente demócrata a nuestra congresista federal Ileana Ros-Lehtinen responde a intereses del régimen de Fidel Castro en Cuba.

El esposo y socio de bufete de esta retadora, tambien abogado, Ira J. Kurzban, representó a Francisco (Pancho) Aruca en un pleito que su agencia Marazul Charters Inc., descrita en la corte como "una corporacion exranjera", estableció en 1989 contra Radio Suave.

Su esposa nacida en Cuba, Magda Montiel-Davis, permanecio siempre en el anonimato publico hasta que anuncio su candidatura contra nuestra congresista cubanoamericana Ileana Ros-Lehtinen hace apenas dos semanas.

Montiel-Davis pertenece al bufete legal de su esposo, Kurzban Kurzban and Weinger, P.A. y mantiene sus oficinas en el mismo local que este. El bufete de la pareja también ha defendido a los haitianos y a los "maceitos" de Andrés Gómez. En 1989, este bufete fue escogido por el gobierno del tirano Fidel Castro para defender los intereses de Marazul, de Aruca, firma inscrita como extranjera, ya que le pertenece al gobierno de Castro.

Es de suponer que Castro no iba confiarle su dinero y la defensa legal de su agente más visible en Miami, Pancho Aruca, a un bufete enemigo *políticamente o en el que no* pudiera confiar plenamente.

La pregunta que se desprende es: ¿que cubano exiliado en su sano juicio votaria en favor de una desconocida -socia y esposa de un abogado de la confianza de Fidel Castro- y en contra de Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, que siempre ha defendido a los cubanos del exilio en su lucha por sus derechos y contra la tiranía castro-comunista de Cuba?

Los cubanos pro-castristas o pro-comunistas que apoyan a la oponente de Ros-Lehtinen, tratan de hacer ver que Ileana y la Fundación Nacional Cubano Americana, presidida por Jorge Mas Canosa, piensan igual y son la misma cosa.

Se trata, naturalmente, de una estrategia mezquina y baja que intenta restarle el apoyo a nuestra congresista de parte de los cubanos patriotas y dignos que luchan por la libertad de su patria, y condenan a Mas Canosa y su Fundación como grupo oportunista, entreguista y politiquero, que lucra con el dolor del pueblo cubano.

Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, sin embargo, era una figura pública más que conocida, querida y respetada en Miami como profesora primero y luego como legisladora y senadora estatal, mucho antes de que la Fundación se dedicara a utilizar los fondos recaudados para la libertad de Cuba para ganar influencias con los politicos, apoyandolos económicamente en sus campañas.

Ileana Ros luchó en dos contiendas electorales contra norteamericanos democratas liberales, repudiados por los hispanos de Miami, y la Fundación no echó rodilla en tierra por ella.

A nadie debe sorprenderle que, una vez que Ileana ya estaba instalada en el Congreso de los Estados Unidos en Washington, por el abrumador voto cubano e hispano de su pueblo en Miami, la Fundacion, en un derroche de su caracteristico oportunismo barato, tratara de sumarse al carro de su sonada victoria.

No nos importa que esta traicionera Fundación contribuya económicamente a la campana de Ileana. Sabemos que nuestra congresista se debe a los intereses del pueblo que la eligio

con más del 95 % de los votos cubanos, y no a los de la Fundación. Al que le quede alguna duda, que revise el historial de nuestra congresista y vea que siempre ha luchado y votado en favor de la libertad de Cuba y en contra del régimen de Fidel Castro.

La Fundacion, sin embargo, jamas ha lanzado un plan para la liberación de Cuba, a pesar de su poderio politico y económico.

Pero mas grave todavia. Su presidente Jorge Mas Canosa, finalmente se ha quitado la *careta de libertador* y ha confesado su traicion abierta a la "unidad para la guerra", que proclamó aqui en Miami junto a otras organizaciones hace menos de dos meses.

Jorge Mas Canosa confiesa su traidora estrategia de dialogo con los verdugos del regimen de Fidel Castro en Cuba.

En sus declaraciones mas recientes a la prensa, un Mas Canosa, que permanecio callado durante el embate del huracán Andrew, aunque se ha autodenominado lider del exilio cubano, produjo un escándalo entre los cubanos patriotas cuando confeso:

1.- Que su Fundación no apoya "ninguna intervención militar en Cuba, provenga de donde sea, incluso de Estados Unidos".

2- Que abriga esperanzas de poder producir un cambio pacífico en Cuba, según el: "sin sangre".

3.- Que no sólo apoya el dialogo y las negociaciones con el gobierno cubano, sino que además lleva más de dos años manteniendo contacto sobre el futuro politico de Cuba con importantes funcionarios del gobierno de Cuba.

4.- Que su Fundación prepara una emision de bonos de hasta $1.000 millones para ayudar a la privatizacion de la economia estatal de la isla para cuando caiga el régimen comunista de Castro.

Mas Canosa, que se reunió con un grupo de periodistas en Nueva York después de explicarle el plan de reconstruccion de Cuba postCastro de la Fundación a miembros de Americas Society, dijo que la emision de bonos generaría una economia de mercado libre de entre $7.000 y $16.000 millones en dos años.

El mercader, Mas Canosa, anteriormente ayudó a incluir en el Proyecto de Ley Torricelli prebendas economicas para Fidel Castro, entre las que se destacan la activacion de un nuevo cable telefónico entre Cuba y Estados Unidos que implica mas de $15 millones anuales para Castro y unos $75 millones al principio.

Nuestra congresista, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, sin embargo, siempre ha estado muy clara en su apoyo a los combatientes cubanos que luchan militarmente y con las armas contra la tirania castrista y se opuso energicamente a las ventajas para Castro que incluia la Ley Torricelli.

Nuestra representante se ha mantenido en todo momento muy clara en contra a ningún tipo de dialogo, negociacion o entreguismo, ya sea con el tirano que excaviza al pueblo cubano o con sus funcionarios.

Nuestra representante seguira levantando su voz firme en los historicos salones del Capitolio en Washington en favor de una Cuba libre y soberana, sin entreguismos, sin claudicaciones, y sin traiciones.

Así lo indican sus condiciones como cubana digna, que cree firmemente en la libertad de su pueblo, su historial como figura publica, el de su familia y, principalmente, el de su padre, Enrique Ros, bien conocido entre los cubanos del exilio, como un hombre honesto y un incansable luchador por la libertad de su patria.

Finalmente, nuestra representante no necesita el apoyo económico de la Fundacion para su campaña electoral. A ella y a su familia le sobran los recursos economicos para su reeleccion.

Apóyela quien la apoye, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen ha demostrado siempre que se debe a las necesidades de su pueblo y a su propia conciencia, y no a los intereses de ningún grupo de cabilderos en particular.

Podemos decirle con toda seguridad a los intereses castristas y comunistas del exilio que lanzaron la candidatura de su contrincante democrata y que tratan de restarle popularidad a Ileana, vinculándola a la entreguista y oportunista Fundación, que su estrategia fracaso.

Los votantes saben de sobra que, en efecto, la Fundacion de Jorge Mas Canosa y nuestra representante Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, ni son ni han sido jamás, la misma cosa.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

App. 31

La Verdad
No. 1108 SEPTEMBER 24, 1992, page 7

CASTROITE DEMOCRAT CHALLENGING OUR CONGRESSWOMAN ILEANA ROS

CASTRO ITE CHALLENGING OUR CONGRESSWOMAN ILEANA ROS

by Hilda Inclán

[photo of Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen]

Last week, we published on this page a copy of the legal documents of the case of the Eleventh Judicial Court of Dade County, number 89-40564 CA 02, which shows that the Democratic opponent of our Federal Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen responds to interests of Fidel Castro's regime in Cuba.

The husband and law firm partner of this challenger, also a lawyer, Ira J. Kurzban, represented Francisco (Pancho) Aruca in a lawsuit which his agency, Marazul Charters Inc., described in court as "a foreign corporation," filed in 1989 against Radio Suave.

His wife, Cuban-born, Magda Montiel-Davis, always remained in public anonymity until she announced her candidacy against our Cuban-American Congresswoman, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, just two weeks ago.

Montiel-Davis is a member of her husband's law firm, Kurzban Kurzban and Weinger, P.A., and she has her offices in the same premises as the latter. The couple's law firm has also defended Haitians and the "Maceitos" of Andrés Gómez. In 1989, this law firm was chosen by

the *government of the tyrant Fidel Castro to defend the interests of Aruca's Marazul, a firm registered as foreign, because it belongs to Castro's government.*

It is to be supposed that Castro was not going to trust his money and the legal defense of his most visible agent in Miami, *Pancho Aruca, to a law firm which was his enemy politically or one which he could not fully trust.*

The question which arises is: what Cuban exile in his right mind would vote in favor of an unknown – a partner and wife of a lawyer trusted by Fidel Castro – and against Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, who has always defended exiled Cubans in their struggle for their rights and against the Castro-communist tyranny of Cuba?

Pro-Castro or pro-communist Cubans who support Ros-Lehtinen's opponent try to make it look like Ileana and the Cuban-American National Foundation, headed by Jorge Mas Canosa, think alike and are the same thing.

It is a question, naturally, of a mean and low strategy which tries to take away the support for our Congresswoman on the part of the patriotic and worthy Cubans who fight for their country's freedom and condemn Mas Canosa and his Foundation as an opportunist, exploiting and politically scheming group, which profits from the Cuban people's pain.

Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, however, was a public figure who was already very well-known, loved and respected in Miami, first as a teacher and then as a state representative and senator, long before the Foundation engaged in using funds collected for the liberty of Cuba to earn

influence among politicians, supporting them financially in their campaigns.

Ileana Ros fought in two electoral battles against American liberal Democrats, repudiated by Hispanics from Miami, and the Foundation did not lift a finger for her.

It should come as a surprise to no one that once Ileana was already a member of the United States Congress in Washington, due to the overwhelming Cuban a [sic] Hispanic vote of her people in Miami, the Foundation, in a burst of its characteristic cheap opportunism, tried to leap on the bandwagon of her resounding victory.

It does not matter to us that this traitor Foundation contributes financially to Ileana's campaign. We know that our Congresswoman is indebted to the interests of the people who elected her with more than 95% of the Cuban vote, and not to those of the Foundation. Should there be any doubt, check the record of our Congresswoman and you will see that she has always fought and voted in favor of Cuba's freedom and against Fidel Castro's regime.

The Foundation, however, has never set forth a plan for Cuba's liberation, in spite of its political and economic power.

But more serious still, its President, Jorge Mas Canosa, has finally removed is [sic] mask as a *liberator* and has acknowledged his open betrayal of "unity for the war," which he proclaimed here in Miami together with other organizations less than two months ago.

Jorge Mas Canosa acknowledges his traitorous strategy of dialogue with the executioners of Fidel Castro's regime in Cuba.

In his most recent statements to the press, Mas Canosa, who remained silent during the onslaught of Hurricane Andrew, although he has named himself the leader of the Cuban exile community, caused a scandal among patriotic Cubans when he acknowledged:

1. That his Foundation does not support "any military intervention in Cuba, from anywhere, including the United States."

2. That he harbors hopes of being able to bring about peaceful change in Cuba, according to him: "without blood."

3. That he not only supports dialogue and negotiations with the Cuban government, but that he has also for more than two years maintained contact regarding Cuba's political future "with important officials of the of the [sic] Cuban government."

4. That his Foundation is preparing to issue up to $1 billion dollars in bonds to aid privatization of the island's state-run economy for when Castro's communist regime falls.

Mas Canosa, who met with a group of journalists in New York after explaining the Foundation's post-Castro reconstruction plan for Cuba to members of the Americas Society, said that the issuance of bonds would create a 7 – to 16 – billion dollar free-market economy in two years.

The merchant, Mas Canosa, previously helped include in the Bill for the Torricelli Act economic benefits for Fidel Castro, including those which call for activation of a new telephone cable between Cuba and the United States which means more than 15 million dollars a year for Castro and some 75 million dollars to start.

Our Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, however, has always been very clear in her support for the Cuban combatants who fight militarily and with weapons against Castro's tyranny, and she energetically opposed the benefits for Castro which the Torricelli Act included.

Our Representative has remained very clear at all times against any kind of dialogue, negotiation or political scheming, whether it is with the tyrant who enslaves the Cuban people or with his officials.

Our Representative will continue to speak out firmlyin [sic] the historic halls of the Capitol in Washington in favor of a free and sovereign Cuba, without giving in giving up, and without betrayals.

Thus do her conditions as a worthy Cuban indicate, that she believes firmly in the liberty of her people, her record as a public figure, that of her family and, mainly, that of her father, Enrique Ros, well known among the Cuban exile community as an upright man and a tireless fighter for the liberty of their country.

Finally, our Representative does not need the financial support of the Foundation for her electoral campaign. She and her family have more than enough financial resources for her reelection.

Support her who may, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen has always demonstrated that she has a duty to the needs of her people and to her own conscience, and not to the interests of any groups of leaders in particular.

We can say with all assurance to the Castro interests and communists in exile who launched her Democratic opponent's candidacy and who try to detract from Ileana's popularity, linking her to the politically scheming and opportunist Foundation, that their strategy failed.

The voters know all too well that, in fact, Jorge Mas Canosa's Foundation and our representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen are not, and never have been, the same thing.

STATE OF FLORIDA)
) SS
COUNTY OF DADE)

BEFORE ME, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE STATE OF FLORIDA AT LARGE, PERSONALLY APPEARS DR. LUIS A. DE LA VEGA – VICE PRES. FOR AND ON BEHALF OF PROFESSIONAL TRANSLATING SERVICES, WHO, AFTER BEING DULY SWORN, DEPOSES AND SAYS THAT (S)HE IS FULLY VERSED IN THE SPANISH AND THE ENGLISH LANGUAGES, AND THAT THIS IS A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT CONSISTING OF 2 PAGE(S), AND THAT THIS IS THE LAST OF THE ATTACHED.

/s/ Dr. Luis A. De La Vega, Vice Pres.

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED THIS 11th DAY OF April, A.D., 1994.

/s/ Angela Smith
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF FLORIDA
AT LARGE

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 12-27-96 (Seal)

(Seal) NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF FLORIDA
ANGELA SMITH
COMMISSION NO: CC-243189
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
DEC. 27, 1996

The utmost care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of all translations. Professional Translating Services and its employees shall not be liable for any damages due to its own negligence or errors in typing or translation, nor shall it be liable for the negligence of third parties.